

SEP 0 2 2003

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

41

Group Art Unit 1652

Patent Application of

Rodney A. Welch, et. al.

Application No. 10/002,309

Confirmation No. 2988

Filed: October 26, 2000

Examiner: David J. Steadman

"E. COLI O157:H7 C1 ESTERASE INHIBITOR-BINDING PROTEIN AND METHODS OF USE"

I, Julie Mallder, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the US Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date of my signature.

TEM CENTER 1600/2900

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In the matter of the above-identified application, and in response to the Office Action mailed July 25, 2003, Applicants reply as follows.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner identified eight inventions: Group I (claims 1-11), drawn to an isolated polypeptide; Group II (claims 12-14), drawn to a genetic construct and a cell comprising said genetic construct; Group III (claims 15 and 16), drawn to an antibody; Group IV (claim 17), drawn to a method of preventing or treating colitis or hemolytic uremic syndrome by administering an antibody; Group V (claim 18), drawn to a method of preventing colitis or hemolytic uremic syndrome by administering an inactivated polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 2; Group VI (claim 19), drawn to a method of preventing or treating colitis and/or hemolytic uremic syndrome by administering C1 esterase inhibitor; Group VII (claim 20), drawn to a method for testing a molecule for the ability to reduce proteolysis of C1 esterase inhibitor by an inhibitor protein; and Group VIII (claim 21), drawn to a method for detecting a bacterium comprising a polynucleotide encoding sequence.

Applicants elect the Group I, claims 1-11, with traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims of the present application could be examined together without placing any serious burden on the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The claims of Groups I –VIII are so closely related to one another that, for efficiency, they should be examined in a single application.

For reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that restriction of examination to one of the eight groups of claims set forth in the Office Action would be improper under 35 U.S.C. §121. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

No fee is believed due in connection with this submission. Please charge or credit Deposit Account No. 50-0842 with any shortage or overpayment of the above fee.

Respectfully submitted,

Charlene L. Yager

Reg. No. 48,887

Docket No.: 096429-9117 Michael Best & Friedrich LLP One South Pinckney Street P. O. Box 1806 Madison, WI 53701-1806 (608) 257-3501